

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. Claims 2-5 and 7 are cancelled. Claims 8-18 are new. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0012642) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,686,902). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites typing in first and last letters of a word to be input and pressing a function key, and retrieving words having the same first and last letters as the typed-in first and last ones and having more than 6 letters, wherein a cursor moves in front of the last letter so as to enable an additional letter to be input, and the retrieved words is displayed in a sequence of higher retrieval-frequency, in combination with the other limitations.

Yang and Lee, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest inputting a desired word by using the first letter and the last letter. Yang and Lee at best are directed to input methods in which the letters of a word are input sequentially. Further, Yang and Lee, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest that a word to be retrieved has more than 6 letters. Words having more than 6 letters cannot be retrieved in the methods of Yang and Lee. Further, Yang and Lee, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest moving a cursor in front of the last letter so as to enable an additional letter to be input and displaying the retrieved words in a sequence of higher

retrieval-frequency. Lee at best is directed to an input method in which a cursor moves to a next (right) position when the pressing of the key is terminated. See, col. 2, ll. 16-19. Yang at best is directed to an input method in which a second character arrangement is determined in the order of probability values for the characters assigned to each button. See, Abstract.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claim 6 defines over the art cited by the Examiner.

New claims 8-18 are presented to provide Applicant with a varied scope of protection for the invention and should also be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec 27, 2008

By: 

G. Gregory Schwley,
Reg. No. 27,882

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GGS/PFD/jas